UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,685	08/19/2003	Toshiyuki Sakuma	500.43055X00	2734

24956 7590 12/09/2008

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
CHONG CRUZ, NADJA N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/642,685	SAKUMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NADJA CHONG CRUZ	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *12-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *12-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 July 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This is a Final office action is in reply to the response filed on 18 July 2008.

2. Claims 12-17 have been added.

3. Claims 1-11 have been canceled.

4. Claims 12-17 are currently pending and have been examined.

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

6. The objection of the drawings in the previous office action is withdrawn, in response to Applicant's amendments. The examiner thanks the applicant for correcting this minor flaw.

7. The objection of the specification in the previous office action is withdrawn, in response to Applicant's amendments. The examiner thanks the applicant for correcting this minor flaw.

8. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 6 and 8 under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments. However, a new grounds for the 35 USC § 112, 2nd rejection of claims 12-17 have been asserted below, as necessitated by amendment.

9. The rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC § 101 is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments. However, a new grounds for the 35 USC § 101 rejection of claims 12-14 have been asserted below, as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

12. Claims 12 and 15 recites the limitations *the number of said supply disabled item, the first number of total items, the second number of items* and *the third number of items*. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

13. Claims 12 and 15 recites the limitation *calculating, in a supply planning unit and according to a conventional manner a supply plan proposal. A conventional manner* is vague and indefinite and causes the claim indefinite. This term is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ensuring the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably aware of the scope of the invention.

14. Claims 12 and 15 recites the limitation *displaying said first list screen and said second list screen in manner of list or in a separate manner on a display device. In a separate manner* is vague and indefinite and causes the claim indefinite. This term is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ensuring the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably aware of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

15. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

16. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond* v. *Diehr,* 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker* v. *Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk* v. *Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane* v. *Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

17. An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

18. Here, applicant's method steps, fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to another statutory class and can be performed without the use of a particular apparatus. Thus, claims 12-14 are non-statutory since they may be preformed within the human mind.

19. Nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process. See Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72. As Comiskey recognized, "the mere use of the machine to collect data necessary for application of the mental process may not make the claim patentable subject matter." Comiskey, 499 F.3d at 1380 (citing In re Grams, 888 F.2d 835, 839-40 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Incidental physical limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, and post-solution activity are not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process. In other words, nominal or token recitations of structure in a method claim do not convert an otherwise ineligible claim into an eligible one. Claims 13-14 inherit the same deficiencies as claim 12 and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as claim 12.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments received on 18 July 2008 are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidow (US 6,889,197 B2) in view of Uhrig et al., (US 2005/0075949 A1) hereinafter Uhrig and further in view of both Grosvenor et al (US 7,216,086 B1), hereinafter "Grosvenor" and Hanazato et al., (US 2004/0064350 A1), hereinafter 'Hanazato".

Claim 12:

Lidow as shown discloses a supply-and-demand plan method and system for making a supply plan for realizing supply of each item by satisfying a delivery time for demand on the basis of planned demand for each site capable of manufacturing, replenishing, distributing or selling a plurality of items, the method and system comprising:

- *calculating, in a supply planning unit and according to a conventional manner, a supply plan proposal for every site, every time point and every item on the basis of at least planned demand, stock, remaining order, time information of a present time, lead time, component table and information of safety stock* (Figures 4-9, column 26, lines 50-55, where the figures illustrates a supply chain server (e.g., a supply planning unit) which it calculates according to a conventional manner a supply plan proposal (e.g., "Resolve Demand Issues 126", "Validate Supplier Capacity 142", "Send New Forecast to Suppliers(s) 174") based on demand (e.g., "Evaluate

Customer Demand Variability 104), "customer contract 214" (e.g., remaining order, lead time), "Customer product information 213" (e.g., stock, remaining order, time information, component table, safety stock") and customer forecast information. Further Lidow discloses that when extra products are “received by server 74” they “are determined by actuarial calculations based upon prior forecasts. These extra products are updated periodically so that they remain fresh and not outdated. In this way, server 74 insures for demand spikes and supply shortages.”);

- *and storing results of calculating into a storage unit* (Figures 19 and 23, which Figure 19 illustrates types of information and corresponding time intervals by the supply chain network and Figure 23 illustrates an storage device “568”. Lidow teaches that in order to provide information and generating reports, the information have been previously stored into a storage unit);
- *comparing supply capacity of said each site previously stored with said supply plan proposal calculated for every time point* (Figures 7, 8 and 10A and column 16, lines 1-10, which they illustrates that “supply chain server 74 queries 144 whether the aggregated customer demand is greater than the supplier capacity. Supplier capacity may be determined from data supplied by suppliers to server 74 or by suppliers 76 allowing access to their respective databases by server 74. If the demand is not greater than the capacity, then supply chain server 74 branches to step 330 explained with reference to FIG. 10A. If the demand is greater than the capacity, then supply chain server 74 branches to a constrained supply planning routine 148 as is shown in FIG. 8". Lidow teaches that the supply chain server perform a comparison between the capacity and the demand information previously stored in their respective databases);
- *and deriving, in case of presence of a supply disabled item, the number of said supply disabled item and site and time point at which supply becomes disabled, and storing the number of said supply disabled item and said site and time point at*

which supply becomes disabled as information representing a supply disabled reason into said storage unit (Figure 8, which teaches a constrained supply planning routine where the customer demand is greater than the capacity, the system perform an iterative process in order to find a balance between demand and capacity and column 16, lines 11-51: " ...if the demand is not greater than the capacity, supply chain server 74 branches to 330 in the Procurement Module. Otherwise, supply chain server 74 branches to customer intervention 158. In customer intervention 158, supply chain server 74 communicates with customers 72 to ascertain any possible customer flexibility (e.g., part substitutions, early or postponed delivery) to thereby produce a new customer demand.", the system contact all related customer/suppliers by notifying a supply disabled in the supply chain and then perform an allocate supply routine, "the parts which actually are available from suppliers ("constrained parts") are allocated equally among the demanding customers and the forecasts of the customers are altered accordingly.");

- *generating, as to a plurality of preceding periods of a schedule, a first list screen displaying at least planned demand at each of said preceding periods, supply plan proposals corresponding to said planned demand at each of said preceding periods, a site where a supply disabled state occurred and the number of a supply disabled item* (Figure 24, which is a more detailed architecture of supply chain server and column 28, lines 1-10: "[p]lanner support tool 586 allows Planners working for server 74 to manipulate forecast, demand and supply data" this tool allow Planners to generate forecasts and find solutions when a supply disabled occurs since it "aggregates data extracted from ERP system 584 thereby facilitating flexible, configurable analysis methods, providing a wide range of reporting capabilities" (e.g., a first list screen displaying planned demand, supply chain proposals), "providing a definition of exception conditions" (e.g., a site where a

supply disable occurred, the number of a supply disabled item) in the analysis process");

- *displaying, upon reception of an input specified by a user concerning a supply disabled site* (column 14, lines 52-54, which teaches that "[s]upply chain server 74 receives these inputs 98, 100 and performs a validation 102 of demands made by customers 72 in forecasts 100");
- *supply plan proposals in contrast with every supply capacity in every period of a schedule at said supply disabled site* (column 14, lines 55-59, which teaches that "supply chain server 74 performs an evaluation 104 of the variability of forecasts 100" (e.g., every supply capacity in every period of a schedule) "and issues exception notifications 106" (e.g., supply plan proposals) "when the variability of the forecasts do not conform to defined parameters.");
- *and updating said supply plan proposals and information representing said supply disabled reason stored in said storage unit* (column 14, lines 55-59 and column 10, line 5, which teaches that "supply chain server 74 performs an evaluation 104 of the variability of forecasts 100 and issues exception notifications 106" (e.g., updated supply plan proposals) "when the variability of the forecasts do not conform to defined parameters" where "[t]he exception notification itself is stored");

Lidow does not specifically teach the following limitations, however Uhrig in an analogous art of analyzing and planning an inventory for the purpose of classifying and ranking sales and inventory (¶ 0089-0090) as shown does:

- *classifying each item into ranks of sales importance degree and inventory importance degree* (¶ 0089, which teaches that an ABC analysis is used "to identify those SKUs that have the most significant impact on the stocking plan" where ABC "is an analytical technique well known in the inventory management art" (e.g., ABC

classification and stratification is a common method for ranking the relative importance of inventory items based on sales));

- *and generating a second list screen displaying information of the first number of total items classified according to each of said sales importance degree and inventory importance degree, the second number of items necessary to be readjusted concerning safety stock among said first number and the third number of items counter-planned among said first number* (¶ 0090, which teaches that "[t]he generate actions process of block 90 enables end users to study and identify recommended actions for implementing the new stocking plan. Views of the data" (e.g., a second list screen displaying information) "are generated that give summary and detail item information" (sales and inventory importance degree), "show the differences between the current position and the new stocking plan, and describe the actions required to achieve the new plan.");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to classify each item into ranks of sales and inventory importance degree and display the information concerning safety stock as taught by Uhrig, to improve Lidow, thereby giving the predictable result of identifying "new items that need to be added to the inventory and existing items that need to be deleted from the inventory in order to achieve the new stocking plan" (e.g., safety stock concerns) (Uhrig, ¶ 0091).

Lidow and Uhrig does not specifically teach the following limitations, however Grosvenor in an analogous art of supply chain management for the purpose of displaying a supply disable item (Figure 3A and 3B) as shown does:

- *providing, upon reception of an input specified by a user concerning information of said item highlighted* (column 34, Claim 13: "…instructions for periodically evaluating one or more existing alerts" (e.g., item highlighted) "that are stored in an alerts table of the database...");

- *a list screen of said item judged as supply disabled and a detail screen in which a site where supply of said item is disabled is clarified* (Figure 3A and 3B, column 9 lines 12-66 and column 10 lines 1-37, which teaches a screen display showing an alert title bar 312 presents the name of the current type of alerts that is displayed, as in FIG. 3A. Properties pane 356 presents values for specific properties of the alert, and the values correspond to those displayed in alert data 316 under field headings 314 in screen display 300 of FIG. 3A. Variance pane 358 presents information about the number of times similar alerts have occurred for the same supply chain partner. Configuration pane 360 presents information about variance configuration parameters (i.e. what percent variance constitutes an exception condition), and who has been configured to receive notification. Drilldown link pane 354 presents one or more links, selection of which causes the system to display even further detailed information relating to the alert" and see at least column 10-12, Table 1 "Available Drill-Down Views" and "Examples of Rules" for alerts examples.);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display a list and detail screen of a disable item as taught by Grosvenor, to improve Lidow and Uhrig, thereby giving the predictable result of providing alerts "to the supply chain partners who are participating in a transaction to which the discrepancies relate. Each alert remains active until second information is received that represents a second supply chain event that resolves the alert" and this will "guarantee that appropriate action is taken in response to problems" (Grosvenor, column 2, lines 62-67 and 39, respectively).

Lidow teaches that "[p]lanners contact customers, using for example, e-mail, and suppliers and suggest adjustments to their respective production plans to create a better supply and demand balance for all parties. Server 74 notifies Planners of these conditions using exception reporting. Planners can use a Planner Supply Tool (discussed below) which provides valuable and unique information produced by supply chain server 74. Planners can thus make

better suggestions on how supply and demand can be balanced than that which could be performed by a customer or supplier on their own." (Lidow, column 8, lines 12-22). Further, Lidow teaches that "[t]he supply chain server checks with the suppliers to determine whether the forecasts can be fulfilled by the suppliers. If the forecasts cannot be fulfilled by the suppliers, the supply chain server contacts customers and suppliers and attempts to either redistribute the customers' demands to different suppliers" (e.g., shifting quantity of supply plan over a supply capacity to a supply plan of another period of said schedule) "or request that customers alter their demands. When supply issues have been resolved, the customers' demands are sent to the suppliers in groups so that the suppliers need to prepare a smaller number of large orders" (column 3, lines 31-39). Uhrig teaches that by identifying locations with low inventory turns, "the stocking strategy may be adjusted to require fewer items to be stocked at those locations" (Uhrig, ¶ 0107). Grosvenor teaches that "[e]ach alert" (e.g., a disabled item) remains active until second information is received that represents a second supply chain event that resolves the alert" (Grosvenor, column 2, lines 64-67).

Lidow, Uhrig and Grosvenor does not specifically teach adjustment of a delivery time, however Hanazato in an analogous art of supply chain management for the purpose of adjust delivery time (¶ 0162) as shown does:

- *displaying, upon reception of an input specified by a user concerning adjustment of a delivery time, a result in which said supply disable was solved by shifting quantity of supply plan over a supply capacity to a supply plan of another period of said schedule* (¶ 0162, which teaches that "[t]he modification value is sent" (e.g., upon reception of an input) "to the supply chain management apparatus 202 to make the modification to the demand forecast information. Based on the modified finished product demand forecast information, modification are again made to the part demand forecast information, the part delivery schedule information, and the finished product delivery schedule information to allow adjustment of the production schedule, the delivery schedule," (e.g., delivery time) "the sales schedule and the

like of the distributor, the finished product manufacturer, and the part manufacturer.");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust delivery time as taught by Hanazato, to improve Lidow, Uhrig and Grosvenor, thereby giving the predictable result of providing and "effective production/supply system based on the number of orders, but also to determine the number of orders in accordance with actual demand, and to smoothly and immediately change an ordering/production/supply system even when actual demand is changed". (Hanazato, ¶ 0164).

Lidow, Uhrig, Grosvenor and Hanazato display supply chain management information through a display device. Lidow, Uhrig, Grosvenor and Hanazato do not expressly disclose:

- *displaying said first list screen and said second list screen in manner of list or in a separate manner on a display device;*
- *displaying information of item judged as supply disabled in a highlighted manner in said first list screen;*

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that is old and well known in graphical user interface art and to one of the ordinary skill in the art to display a first list screen and second list screen in form of a list or in separate manner in order to enables a user to view different information in one screen or in an additional screen and to highlight priority items in order to allow a user to select it. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lidow, Uhrig, Grosvenor and Hanazato with the old and well-known practice of displaying a screen list with information and to highlight an item based on user display preferences, thereby giving the predictable result of enabling a user through a user friendly environment to view and identify a supply management information in a easy and faster way.

Claim 15:

The limitations of claim 15 encompass substantially the same scope as claim 12. Accordingly, those similar limitations are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 12, as described above. The following are the limitations of claim 15 that differ from claim 12.

- *means for storing a supply capacity of said each site* (Figures 7, 8 and 10A and column 16, lines 1-10, which they illustrates that "supply chain server 74 queries 144 whether the aggregated customer demand is greater than the supplier capacity. Supplier capacity may be determined from data supplied by suppliers to server 74 or by suppliers 76 allowing access to their respective databases by server 74" where Lidow teaches that a supply capacity of each site are stored);

Claims 13 and 16:

Lidow as shown discloses the following limitations:

- *displaying, upon reception of instruction made by a user concerning change of supply means or change of supply capacity* (column 14, lines 52-59, which teaches that "[s]upply chain server 74 receives these inputs 98, 100 and performs a validation 102 of demands made by customers 72 in forecasts 100" and "performs an evaluation 104 of the variability of forecasts 100 and issues exception notifications 106 when the variability of the forecasts do not conform to defined parameters.");

Lidow does not specifically teach the following limitations, however Grosvenor in an analogous art of supply chain management for the purpose of displaying a supply disable item (Figure 3A and 3B) as shown does:

- *a screen displaying a list of usable supply means or a screen displaying present load, present capacity and an input column of capacity change for every period of schedule* (Figure 3B, illustrates a screen displaying a list of usable supply means);

- *and displaying, upon reception of selection input by a user concerning said change of said supply means or upon reception of input of change by a user concerning said supply capacity, a result in which occurrence of a supply disabled item is removed* (column 2, lines 64-67, which teaches that [e]ach alert" (e.g., a disabled item) remains active until second information is received" (e.g., input) "that represents a second supply chain event that resolves the alert" (e.g., a result in which occurrence of a supply disabled item is removed));

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display a list of a disable item and to remove it as taught by Grosvenor, to improve Lidow, thereby giving the predictable result of providing alerts "to the supply chain partners who are participating in a transaction to which the discrepancies relate. Each alert remains active until second information is received that represents a second supply chain event that resolves the alert" and this will "guarantee that appropriate action is taken in response to problems" (Grosvenor, column 2, lines 62-67 and 39, respectively).

Claims 14 and 17:

Lidow does not specifically teach the following limitations, however Uhrig in an analogous art of analyzing and planning an inventory for the purpose of classifying and ranking sales and inventory (¶ 0089-0090) as shown does:

- *displaying, upon reception of requirement input by a user concerning readjustment of safety stock* (¶ 0073, which teaches that "[d]emand forecast information is used to adjust stocking plans" (e.g., safety stock) "for seasonal changes in demand and other demand spikes". Uhrig teaches that an input is entered by a user in order to readjust a safety stock based on demand forecast);
- *a list screen of information of safety stock of an item included in classification selected by a user* (¶ 0090, which teaches that "[t]he generate actions process of block 90 enables end users to study and identify recommended actions for

implementing the new stocking plan. Views of the data" (e.g., a list screen displaying information) "are generated that give summary and detail item information" (sales and inventory importance degree), "show the differences between the current position and the new stocking plan, and describe the actions required to achieve the new plan.");

- *displaying, upon reception of selection input by a user concerning change of item, an inventory supply-and-demand progress screen representing inventory progress of corresponding item in contrast with safety stock registered* (¶ 0090-0091, Uhrig teaches that based on the input of the user after changing an item "[e]nd users evaluate this information and decide whether to take one of several possible actions, including but not limited to changing rules or parameters and generating a new stocking plan, overriding specific stocking recommendations, performing additional analyses to investigate the cost of stocking or not stocking specific items, importing more or different inventory data" (e.g., supply and demand progress) "and generating a new stocking plan, and updating the database 14 to reallocate items to another location in the supply chain" based on the current supply and demand of items. Where "[v]iews of the data are generated that give summary and detail item information show the differences between the current position and the new stocking plan," (e.g., represent inventory progress of corresponding item in contrast with safety stock registered) "and describe the actions required to achieve the new plan.");
- *and registering, upon reception of instruction concerning change of registered value of safety stock of an item specified by a user, new safety stock and displaying a screen in which said change of said registered value is reflected* (¶ 0090, which teaches that "[v]iews of the data" (e.g., a list screen displaying information) "are generated that give summary and detail item information" (sales and inventory importance degree), "show the differences between the current position and the

new stocking plan," (e.g., new safety stock) "and describe the actions required to achieve the new plan.");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display the information concerning safety stock as taught by Uhrig, to improve Lidow, thereby giving the predictable result of "generating a new stocking plan, and updating the database 14 to reallocate items to another location in the supply chain". (Uhrig, ¶ 0091).

Lidow teaches that "[p]lanner support tool 586 allows Planners working for server 74 to manipulate forecast, demand and supply data" this tool allow Planners to generate forecasts and find solutions when a supply disabled occurs since it "aggregates data extracted from ERP system 584 thereby facilitating flexible, configurable analysis methods, providing a wide range of reporting capabilities, providing a definition of exception conditions in the analysis process" (column 28, lines 1-10). Uhrig teaches that "[t]he generate actions process of block 90 enables end users to study and identify recommended actions for implementing the new stocking plan. Views of the data" (e.g., a second list screen displaying information) "are generated that give summary and detail item information" (sales and inventory importance degree), "show the differences between the current position and the new stocking plan, and describe the actions required to achieve the new plan." Lidow and Uhrig do not expressly disclose:

- *displaying classification including an item judged as supply disabled in a highlighted manner in said second list screen*

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that is old and well known in graphical user interface art and to one of the ordinary skill in the art to highlight priority items (e.g., an item judged as a supply disable item) in order to allow a user to select it. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lidow and Uhrig with the old and well-known practice of highlighting an item based on user display preferences (e.g., degree of importance), thereby giving the predictable result of enabling a user

through a user friendly environment to view and identify a supply management information in a easy and faster way.

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Nadja Chong** whose telephone number is **570.270.3939.** The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **BETH BOSWEL** can be reached at **571.272.6737.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov >. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window**:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/Nadja Chong/

Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623